

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON DIVISION

|                                    |   |                               |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Jackie B. Wood,                    | ) | C/A No.: 8:07-cv-3622-GRA-WMC |
|                                    | ) |                               |
| Plaintiff,                         | ) |                               |
|                                    | ) |                               |
| v.                                 | ) | <b>ORDER</b>                  |
|                                    | ) | (Written Opinion)             |
| Bobby Harrelson; and Dillon Supply | ) |                               |
| Company,                           | ) |                               |
|                                    | ) |                               |
| Defendants.                        | ) |                               |
|                                    | ) |                               |
|                                    | ) |                               |

---

This matter comes before the Court for a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), D.S.C., filed on December 13, 2007. The plaintiff originally filed her complaint on November 5, 2007, alleging that the defendants violated Title VII by sexually harassing her. The magistrate recommends dismissing this claim without prejudice and without issuance and service of process because the plaintiff failed to exhaust her administrative remedies. For the reasons stated herein, this Court adopts the magistrate's Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

Plaintiff brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *See Gordon v. Leake*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to

allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *See Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.* In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th. Cir. 1983). The plaintiff did not file any objections.

After reviewing the Report and Recommendation, this Court finds that the magistrate applied sound legal principles to the facts of this case. Therefore, this Court adopts the magistrate's Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

IT IS THEREFORE SO ORDERED THAT the complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

[signature block on the next page]



G. ROSS ANDERSON, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

February 7, 2008  
Anderson, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Plaintiff has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days from the date of its entry. Failure to meet this deadline, as modified by Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, **will waive the right to appeal.**